



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/172,830	10/15/98	ZANCO	A 2348-348/2.R

JOHN MOETTEL; BUGNION S.A.
10, ROUTE DE FLORISSANT
CASE POSTALE 375
1211 ENEV GENEVA
SWITZERLAND

QM32/0523

AIR MAIL

EXAMINER	
KAVANAUGH, J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3728
DATE MAILED:

05/23/01

23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER


ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

The reply filed on 5-4-01 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicant didn't fully respond to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections. Applicant states he amended the claims to correct them but he didn't clarify how he amended them. For example, the examiner in the last office action states "it was not clear what element the 'interface' is referring to". The examiner still doesn't know what applicant is referring to. Applicant must also show support for this in the specification and in the drawings. The examiner stated in the last office action "Throughout the claims...consistent terminology throughout the claims". The applicant hasn't responded as to how he specifically corrected this. What language is he using to describe the bearing surface? How and what claims were changed to correct this? How does the changes to claim 5 correct the indefinite language pointed out by the examiner in the last office action? How does the changes to claim 3 correct the indefinite language pointed out by the examiner in the last office action. Moreover, in claim 1, line 4, "the rear region" lacks proper antecedent basis. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be bona fide, applicant is given ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a)


Ted Kavanaugh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3728